



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

satire we have already noted. It had been used already dramatically by Calderon in his *El Conde Lucanor*, (cf. Münch-Bellinghausen : *Ueber die älteren Sammlungen spanischer Dramen*, Wien, 1852, p. 82.), and by Goldoni in his *Il Talismano*; but these now forgotten dramas were probably not known to Fulda. His fine insight into the significance of the old tale made him incorporate into it the very gist of the *Vierzig Veziere* itself, which he probably never heard of. In Behrnauer (p. 149) we find the Oriental saying, "Die Unwahrheit, welche Heil stiftet, ist besser, als die Wahrheit, welche Unheil stiftet." In Sadi's *Gulistan* we find,—*"Die Weisen haben gesagt: Eine Lüge welche gutes bezweckt, ist besser als eine Wahrheit, welche Unheil versteckt,"* (Graf's Übersetzung, p. 17). And Fulda gave the story again its old Oriental setting. Such is the insight of a true poet.

The editor has nothing to say as to the form into which the *Talisman* is cast. Surely a word or two on the Märchendrama might well have been given for its great literary significance. The Märchendrama arose and flourished in Austria: it was the natural expression of the native, poetical Viennese temperament. Its most ardent exponent was Raimund, whose *Der Verschwender* contains much the same thought as Grillparzer's remarkable *Der Traum, ein Leben*, which the former recognized as the ideal he had so often striven to attain (Kuh: *Zwei Dichter Oesterreichs*, p. 94). Under Nestroy the Märchendrama degenerated into farce: this desecration practically led Raimund to take his own life. The apotheosis of the Märchendrama was reached in Grillparzer's *Der Traum, ein Leben*. Fulda had studied this wonderful drama, and saw in it a form of dramatic art which, used discretely, and not too often (Grillparzer himself noted this: cf. *Grillparzer-Jahrbuch*, iii, p. 147; the views of the two poets Grillparzer and Bauernfeld, and the two dramaturgists Schreyvogel and Deinhardstein are most instructive), could express more real truth than all the realistic formlessness of modern stage-plays. Let any one compare Fulda's Rita with Grillparzer's Mirza, and he will see at once how much the *Talisman* is indebted to *Der Traum, ein Leben*. Fulda restored again to their old

supremacy the fine fancy and rich imagination of the German poet. He realized one of the fundamental facts of art, that for each folk there is an indigenous form in which alone its genius can be fully expressed. *Faust* itself is really a Märchendrama on a colossal scale. Fulda's lead with *Der Talisman* (1893) was soon followed by Hauptmann with *Die versunkene Glocke* (1896), and by Sudermann with *Die drei Reihherfedern* (1898). Wildenbruch made the first ineffectual attempt at the fantastic-satirical drama in his *Das heilige Lachen*, but to Fulda's genius alone is due the revival of the Märchendrama.

(To be continued.)

EDWARD STOCKTON MEYER.

Western Reserve University.

SPANISH PUBLICATIONS.

IV.¹

8. *Don Gil de las calzas verdes, comedia en tres actos y en verso, por Fray Gabriel Téllez (el Maestro Tirso de Molina)*. Edited with an introduction, notes and vocabulary by BENJAMIN PARSONS BOURLAND, Ph. D., Assistant Professor in the University of Michigan. New York: Henry Holt & Company, 1901. 8vo, pp. xxvii+198.

DR. BOURLAND, in the Introduction to his edition of *Don Gil*, sets forth, in eleven well-written pages, all that needs to be said about the author and his works, due credit being given to Cotarelo; seven pages deal, concisely but to the point, with the Metre of the play; while a careful Bibliographical Note gives the titles of thirty-one works whose study, in addition to that of the well-known handbooks on the Spanish drama, is all-important for a proper appreciation of the wittiest and least conventional, if not the greatest, of Spanish dramatists.

The play itself (about two thousand five hundred verses) is followed by twenty-four pages of Notes, in which the editor has, with refreshing good sense, omitted translations and what he rightly calls "the commonplaces of history and mythology," and by a Vocabulary that refrains from making "definitions broader or deeper than the text requires." The volume has in front a good reproduction of the author's

¹ Cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES for January, 1898 (vol. xiii, col. 39).

portrait—a new and highly commendable feature in our textbooks.

The Introduction could not be expected to furnish new facts about Tirso's life or proclaim new discoveries in the bibliography of his works. Since the publication of Cotarelo's excellent little monograph (1893) no one but Doña Blanca de los Ríos had undertaken a task so arduous, and no part of her investigations has, to my knowledge, been printed except the curious, though unconvincing, articles in *La España Moderna*, in which she attempted to identify Tirso with the elusive Avellaneda, the author of the spurious second part of *Don Quijote*. Our editor has wisely kept aloof from this contention that has called forth no small amount of literature. He also leaves untouched Salvá's claim (*Catálogo*, 1441; 1443) that the first edition of the *Cigarrales* is of 1621, a claim that appears to have been overthrown by Morf.² He has summed up all that is essential in Cotarelo, not, however, without carefully testing the latter's conclusions, and arriving occasionally at different and well-argued results. Particularly pleasant to note is Dr. Bourland's unaffected enthusiasm and appreciative reverence for Tirso—of which more anon, when we consider the Notes.

Perhaps, in his note to p. xiv, he might also have spoken of Tirso's plays as reworked by Dionisio Solís, in the first quarter of the nineteenth century. Solís had in his day a well-earned reputation as an adapter of classic plays, and a goodly part of Tirso's vogue in those years was undoubtedly due to the intelligent way in which his almost forgotten works were brought before the public.

The various metres found in *Don Gil* are first discussed, and then tabulated by acts and scenes, in pp. xvi–xxiii of the Introduction. The editor's considerations are most acceptable, being clearly worded and, therefore, easily understood. Possibly it might be better to substitute some other word for "regularly" in: "Hiatus between words regularly results in synizesis" (p. xvii), inasmuch as the second example there given admits of no such contraction between the words *No hay*, which in numerous other cases, for instance, in the

verses quoted on p. xxi, becomes imperative. But as Dr. Bourland expresses his hope of publishing a more extended study of hiatus in Tirso, we can well afford to look forward toward seeing this vexatious question competently disposed of for at least one of the foremost dramatic poets.

The editor has preferred the name *cuartetos* for the more current one of *redondillas*, and his remarks on pp. xviii, xxi and xxii might perhaps at first sight be somewhat puzzling to a beginner. Namely, the *redondilla* is not alone the usual, but the only form of the *cuarteto* as such (that is to say, if we consider the *décima* as a unit) in this play, and there is no difference between *Act i, scene 1*, verses 1–60, tabulated as *cuartetos* (*redondillas*) and those named only *cuartetos* in the other scenes. We might advocate the usual and convenient name *romance* for the

"combination of *versos libres*, or blank verses, of eight syllables, with alternating *octosílabos* that rime [read: assonance] with one another, in long series."

This form, true to its history, is indicated where a personage relates his life, as in our play *Act i, scene 1*, and *Act ii, scene 5*, and it is comparatively rare to find it used for dialogue, as in *Act i, scenes 9–10*. The *terza rima* has in Spanish the name *tercetos*, and a word about its conclusion might perchance be of value. Be it also noted here that the verse-form of *Act i, scene 7*, can hardly be called *quintillas*, in spite of its strophe of five lines; while the *décima* of *Act i, scene 6*, is not a model of its kind.

Inadvertencies so slight do not keep this presentation of the metre from being a good and instructive basis for the student's work in the promising field of Spanish versification. The editor deserves our sincere thanks for having begun by brushing aside the mistake of using the term "feet" in connection with Spanish verse. One becomes more and more strengthened in the conviction that the superstition about "feet" is a serious handicap for the understanding of Spanish verse, the conditions being such that it would go hard to find a poem in which, even when the author pretends to write in "feet," the spirit of the language has not made it impossible to be consistent in their use.

² Cf. *Bulletin Hispanique*, iv, No. 1 (Janvier-Mars 1902), p. 40.

In the preparation of the text of the play, the editor has been favored by the circumstance that the *princeps* edition showed none of the distressing imperfections so common in the seventeenth century volumes of dramatic works. Not a verse had dropped out, and hardly a misprint could be detected. Where, moreover, so careful a critic as Hartzzenbusch has twice edited this play, it might be presumed that the present text would be excellent. And, in fact, only a few corrections are needed to make it as perfect as a text can be when its final form, in the author's own handwriting, is not available.

On p. 60, after l. 46, we must insert :

Doña Juana. Muestra. (*Ap.* ¡ Ay cielos !)

a passage that has dropped out in printing, as proven by the verse-numbers.

It might be well to give, at the beginning of the play, the list of *Personas*, preferably with a footnote setting forth their relation to each other.

P. 7, l. 203 calls for a conjectural emendation that will, I trust, do away with all difficulty. Namely, if we read :

Mas la sospecha . . .
Adivinó mis desgracias,
Sabíendolas descubrir
El oro *en que* dos diamantes
Bastantes son para abrir
Secretos de cal y canto.

the meaning becomes : 'the gold [ornament], two diamonds [set] in which.' A change so slight is legitimate, and the syntax should satisfy even so watchful an editor. That Hartzzenbusch could overlook so obvious a correction is indeed surprising.

P. 9, l. 21 :

¿ *Que* tantos habéis tenido ?

means in its connection : [do you mean to say] that you have had so many ? ¿ *Qué* tantos . . . ? , how many . . . ? would better befit the wail that elicits the question.

P. 11, l. 80, rather than

Ojeaba dos autores,

I should read :

Hojeaba dos autores,

for examples abound of *hojear un libro*, *un autor*, while it would take long to find *ojear* with a meaning appropriate to this passage.

The substitution of *Don Andrés* for *Don Martín* on p. 18, l. 38, seems felicitous, especially in view of l. 40, where only *Don An-*

drés can be meant. Were it not for this latter line, the meaning : 'a child (or : children) of Don Martín and my child' would be logical enough.

P. 25, l. 6, the verse surely demands *Bene venuto* ; for the same reason, p. 28, l. 74, lacking one syllable, is improved by Hartzzenbusch's *cuando* for *que* ; and again, l. 80 is not mangled overmuch by reading with Hartzzenbusch :

Cosa que no os esté bien,

P. 31, l. 157, should of course be contracted into *apartese* (compare p. 81, l. 68 : *suelleté*, and p. 89, l. 42 : *Hablamé*).

P. 37, l. 31, the *busquen* is inadmissible ; Hartzzenbusch reads *buscan*, the only possible form.

P. 56, l. 23, and p. 70, l. 22, it would seem better to transfer to the Notes the passages between [], since it is customary thus to mark inserted words, not the eliminated passages. P. 63, l. 6, should, inversely, have [es] ; p. 73, l. 24, [señor] ; and p. 108, l. 10, [ya].

The editor rejected Hartzzenbusch's emendation of *su* for *tu* on p. 27, l. 32, saying in the Notes that it is 'happy . . . but . . . unnecessary.' I venture to submit that, since Caramanchel is not aware of Doña Juana's being a woman, the remark would be uncalled for, and *su*, as applied to *dinero*, surely impresses me as the only appropriate reading.

A curious and subtle point of Spanish syntax and, incidentally, also of versification, comes up in connection with a passage on p. 63. The text has :

¿ Porqué mintiendo, Inés, me desvaneces ?
Don Andrés ¿ no me ha escrito por este hombre ?
¿ No dice que es Don Gil el que aborreces ?

to which the editor remarks :

"The reading of the first edition is : *No dize que Don Gil el que aborreces* ? a misprint, in which the predicate *es*, supplied in the text, is omitted before *Don Gil* ; Hartzzenbusch reads *no dices*, a peculiarly inept emendation."

At first sight we might incline to assent, for we may translate :

'Inés, why do you mislead me with lies ? Has not Don Andrés written to me in favor of this man ? Does he not say that the one you detest is Don Gil ?'

which looks plausibly simple ; while it would appear as if Hartzzenbusch had meant, either : 'Has not Don Andrés written to me in favor of this man ? Do you not say that the one you de-

test is *Don Gil?*,' or else: '*Do you not say that Don Gil is the one you detest?*'

Either construction would fully warrant the editor's indignant comment. But there remains one other possible meaning that well deserves our attention.

Hartzenbusch's line would have looked less intricate if he had printed:

¿No, dices, es Don Gil el que aborreces?

but he rightly retained the *que*, in the first place because the original edition had *que*, and secondly, because the word is the constant complement of verbs that mean 'to say,' 'to ask,' and so forth. Sentences like: '*¿Quién es este señor?*' '*Dices que ¿quién es? Pero ¡hombre! ¡si es mi padre!*' explain themselves.

In Spanish dramatic literature the negative word *no* has a somewhat exasperating way of appearing at the beginning of a phrase when, from the un-Spanish point of view, we might wish it to stand immediately before the very words it is meant to negative. The matter has not, to my knowledge, been dealt with in treatises on Spanish syntax, and would well repay a special investigation; but I am not prepared to doubt that Hartzenbusch, the hair-splitting and wonderfully well-read commentator of *Don Quixote*, was quite familiar with it.

The basic principle is that in Spanish a word, when transferred to a place other than its usual one, thereby becomes more conspicuous, and consequently more emphatic. In the verse as emended by Hartzenbusch, the *no* can belong not only to *dices*, but also to *es*, which makes the passage say:

'Has not Don Andrés written to me in favor of this man? [Then how in the world can] you say that the one you detest is not Don Gil?'

My impression is that this version is most befitting the speaker's dignified anger, and surely more forcible than the simple repetition, in different words, of his first question. If Dr. Bourland, who is well familiar with spoken Spanish, reads the verse aloud, in a tone of wondering inquiry and with strong emphasis on *no*, this interpretation may yet find favor with him, while a search through a few dozen plays, especially Alarcón's, will not fail to furnish examples in justification of Hartzenbusch.

However, my defense of Hartzenbusch in no wise takes away from the merit of our editor's own emendation, which for purposes of a

school text is satisfactory enough. Still, I cannot refrain from pointing once more to the endless watchfulness we should exercise over our opinions in the matter of Spanish, the most difficult, and for that very reason the most fascinating, of our modern languages.

Now, if with Hartzenbusch we read *dices*, it may be asked: Does not the sentence become more grammatical when we transpose the *no* to its logical place, as follows:

¿Dices que no es Don Gil el que aborreces?

Strictly speaking, so it would; but the *no* then would stand in hiatus, and lose thereby part of its emphasis, so that the sentence would hardly mean more than: 'Did I understand you right?' This same consideration of emphasis should, I think, be taken into account in any careful study of the treatment of hiatus; perhaps it may furnish a clue to many apparent irregularities of such treatment, or, at least, the results of such a study could scarcely be deemed conclusive if the possibilities of emphasis were overlooked.

On pp. 76, ll. 73-78; 90, l. 67; 108, ll. 24-27, it might be well to place () around the *aparte* speech, in order to simplify the student's task.

On pp. 81-82, in the passage:

¿Manjar soy que satisfago

Antes que me pruebe el gusto?

we must interpret: 'Am I a relish that satiates before the palate tastes me?' I prefer to read:

¿Manjar soy que satisfago,

Antes que me pruebe, el gusto?

which would mean: 'Am I a relish that satiates his desire before he has a taste of me?'

P. 101, ll. 5-10, our text has:

El temor

De que en penas anda, muda

Mi valor en cobardía.

En no meterme me fundo

En cosas del otro mundo,

Que es bárbara valentía.

We may translate this: 'I am scared! The reason is that I don't *poke my nose into* things of the other world, which is foolhardiness.' Hartzenbusch reads:

En no meterme me fundo

Con cosas del otro mundo;

Que es bárbara valentía.

This seems to be far preferable, for it means: 'I am scared! The reason is that I don't *beard* spooks, for that is foolhardiness.'

This is all that I find to observe here about the form of the text, and we can pass on to the

Notes. They are differentiated advantageously from the "Notes" so frequent in our Spanish textbooks, in that they contain much valuable information, in place of startlingly novel misinterpretations that would move a cynic to tears of joy. Especially may we be thankful for the pretty note on p. 141, even though the *seguidilla* has since been printed elsewhere (*Revue Hispanique*, viii, 321, no. 166).³ I had hoped to repay the editor in kind, but the expressions *cazolero* (p. 131) and *macho de Vamba* (p. 142) have, as yet, eluded the most determined search.⁴ For lack of better, the following remarks may perhaps be acceptable.

The last note of p. 123 puzzles me greatly. I heartily share the editor's frank and healthy admiration for Tirso, and with him deplore whatever blemishes bedim the lustre of the great poet's worth; but I fail to see what is wrong in the syntax of i, 8, 14, and ii, 5, 79, to which he takes exception; while ii, 10, 23 and ii, 18, 21-22 may well be set down to the printer of the *princeps*.

P. 126, 89, *le ha dado garrotillo*, is not impersonal, for *garrotillo* is the subject. Literal translation: 'croup has stricken him.'

P. 127, 223. It would seem that there is nothing obscure about the passage, for the editor's first interpretation is most lucid. Perhaps, if we render *moscatel* by 'dude' (p. 17, l. 286, it is adjective) the version might be even more plausible. Covarrubias says: "Moscatel, lo que tiene sabor de musco, vulgarmente dicho almizcle"—from which the transition to an effeminate person is natural.

P. 136, 24: ¡Bonita es ella!, translated: "That's a good one!" is perhaps somewhat misleading. I might suggest: 'That would be just like her!' of course to be taken ironically.

P. 139, 118. If the old punctuation were

3 In the form of a *copia* we find it as follows:

La novia que pretendí
Todas las *efes* tenía:
Francisca, Francha y *fregonia*,
Fea, floja, flaca y fría.

(*Cancionero popular turolense* . . . por Severiano Doporto. Segunda edición, Madrid, Fé, s. a. (1900), no. 567.) See also: Rodríguez Marín, *Cantos populares*, tomo iv, no. 5830, and note.

4. In vol. i of the *Entremeses* of Quiñones de Benavente (*Libros de antaño*, tomo 1), an actress addresses all the occupants of the *cazuela* as "cazolería" (p. 151), and one single occupant as "cazolerilla" (p. 221). It therefore looks as if in our play Doña Inés, by her "Cazolero?" means: 'Would you like to sit down among us?' or to put it in the form of a noun: '[Are you] a ladies' man?' The continuation of the scene appears to bear out this assumption.

retained, *transformó* would have for a subject the *riqueza* of l. 119. We may be glad the editor overlooked this possibility, for his emendation is singularly felicitous.

P. 139, 11. *Dinero de Valencia*. Covarrubias says:

"Dinero en el Reyno de Valencia es moneda menuda: vale lo que en Castilla tres blancas: un real Castellano vale veinte y tres dineros. . . Dinerillo, la dicha moneda Valenciana."

It would seem, therefore, that in our passage the expression means something very small, that easily slips through the fingers.

P. 140, 93-94, read: *mulas de collera*, 'draught mules.'

P. 142, 53. The editor has of course noticed that *mira*, in the passage on p. 90, l. 3, has for a subject *él* (that is Don Gil). The scene is curiously interesting for its use of the pronoun of address: first familiar *tú*, then scornful *él*, presently haughty *vos*, and again friendly *tú*.

It is curious to see that p. 1, l. 17, Tirso speaks of the sand of the Manzanares as *rojo*. The adjective is certainly not appropriate at present. Has the color changed in these three centuries, or did the word *rojo* denote a different tint? P. 110, l. 14 makes me suspect that it meant 'blond'; in fact, the distinction between shades of color is rather vaguely indicated in classical Spanish. In this passage there may perhaps be an intention to make the sand blush for shame of its river.

About the *casas á la malicia* (p. 110, l. 5) I may furnish this note, quoting from Mesonero Romanos (*El antiguo Madrid*, 1861, p. xxxix-xl; 1881—a much more accessible edition—tomo i, pp. 64-65):

"... otra razón muy poderosa para limitar y reducir á mezquinas condiciones el caserío general de Madrid, fué la gravosa carga que el establecimiento de la corte trajo consigo, y era la conocida con el nombre de *Regalía de aposento*. Este pesado servicio del alojamiento de la real comitiva y funcionarios de la corte, recaía naturalmente sobre las casas que tenían más de un piso y cierta espaciosidad, . . . razón por la cual continuaron las construcciones de *malicia* ó sólo piso bajo., etc."

The Vocabulary is in keeping with the excellence of the book. In many cases its renderings are made more valuable by specific references to the passages in the text. The only slips worth indicating here are: *á lo*

caponil, 'capon style, capon wise'; *correrse*, 'to get (be) ashamed' (p. 1, l. 18); *dar de*, 'to hit with, to deal (blows)'; *sea á merced*, '[for pay] I'll take my chances on your generosity' (p. 16, l. 259); *ofrecer*, 'to promise' (p. 21, l. 14); *pasar, v. a.*, 'to do' (p. 39, l. 102); *plata quebrada* refers us to a note that, to my regret, seems to have dropped out in printing. It would, perhaps, have proven that the term can mean "small change," a signification with which I am unfamiliar—at least, it cannot pertain to the passage of p. 81, l. 62, where the translation is: 'battered plate' (that is, as good as coin, because the real ownership cannot be proven).

Summing up, it is a pleasure to record that Dr. Bourland has approached his task in a truly scholarly spirit. The text of the play, if overhauled once more (in which the publisher should also do his share, for the type betrays many signs of long use), may well be accepted as final and standard; while the Introduction and Notes are far and away the best that have yet accompanied a Spanish text published in this country. In short, this edition of *Don Gil* deserves to be ranked with our best school-editions of French and German classics, the more so, since for Spanish classic dramas, with hardly an exception, the editor must be his own pioneer, even to the establishing of his text and the making of his dictionary and grammar.

F. DE HAAN.

Bryn Mawr College.

CORRESPONDENCE.

HISTORY OF THE INTERNATIONAL CORRESPONDENCE IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—Some years ago, soon after the first introduction of the International Correspondence between Professors, Teachers, Students, professional men and women, and others, for the purpose of making a more complete and practical study of foreign languages, my attention was first turned toward this new departure in the educational field by Prof. Thomas A. Jenkins, then Professor of the Ro-

mance Languages in Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee, and now Professor in the same department in the University of Chicago. He had at that time a few students entering upon this work. Of course it will be understood that I refer to the system devised by Prof. P. Mieille, of the Lycée de Tarbes, of Tarbes, France, and who is this year the French editor of *Comrades All*. I introduced the system at once into Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pennsylvania, and since that time a very considerable number of the students in French, and later quite a number of those in German, have been engaged in this correspondence. Gradually, by a series of letters in the public journals explaining this correspondence, and setting forth its advantages for all pursuing the study of spoken foreign languages, the attention of teachers, especially those of the Modern Languages, was turned toward the subject, and in several schools and colleges its introduction was begun. About this time quite an exhaustive history of the system abroad was prepared and published by Prof. Gaston Mouchet of Paris, and this was translated into English, and published in a leading educational New England magazine, the *Education* of Boston, Mass. This was the most effective public movement yet made, and about a year later the attention of the Modern Language Association of America was directed to it by a paper presented at their Annual meeting at the University of Virginia. At that meeting a committee of four was appointed to make further investigation, and report to the Association the result of their investigations at the annual meeting to be held the Christmas week of the following year. This was held at Columbia University (1899), when a very satisfactory report was presented, and the committee was continued, and five more members were added to the number, making a committee of nine, having general charge of the subject, with its central Bureau at Swarthmore College, at Swarthmore, Pa. That committee made a full report in 1900, at the annual meeting held at the University of Pennsylvania, and the committee was again continued without change. The present condition of the correspondence will be best understood by quoting from the Report made at